

# Bill Gallagher

Interviewed by Zachary Schrag, Washington, D.C., July 21, 2021.

Transcript finalized December 7, 2021.

This transcript has been edited by Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Schrag to present an accurate account of Mr. Gallagher's work on Metro, not necessarily a verbatim record of the interview.

*Schrag*

Zachary Schrag is speaking with Bill Gallagher. It is July 21, 2021. We're at his office in Washington, DC.

We're going to be talking today about Metro, the Weese design, its evolution, challenges and preservation as well.

Could we just talk a little bit about your own career path? I know you started working for Weese in the 1970s. But what's the chronology there?

*Gallagher*

I just got out of school. It was the summer of '76. It was the summer the Metro opened. So my whole family came, and we all went to the opening of Metro. I just loved how wonderful it was. And wouldn't it be nice to be involved in it,

I got a call from Weese's office. I was looking for a job. And they heard I was looking for a job. And they called me or called my father. And he said, Oh, he's got a temporary job. He doesn't need—he's not interested. I kind of blew up. Of course, I'm interested in it, he's famous. So anyway, they told me if I could start that night or the next night—at night, because there's no place for me to sit—I had a job. So I did.

That was actually working on the Northeast Corridor, all the train stations.

*Schrag*

Where were you in school?

*Gallagher*

I was at Wake Forest in North Carolina. It had a degree in math and physics. And I went to University of Tennessee to their graduate program in architecture. I was there a few years, three years, I guess. Then I came back to Washington looking for a job, and I got the job at Weese's office. Then after eight years, I went back to graduate school again, at Harvard, in urban design.

*Schrag*

Okay, so you were with Weese, 1976, to 84. And then Harvard. And after that?

*Gallagher*

I worked in all the firms in Boston, it seems like.

But I was really spoiled by Harry Weese's office. Here's the way that office worked: it was very open and very educational in so many ways. I'd tell him, I wanted to go for a trip to Europe. And I said I was going to be gone a couple of weeks. He said, Well, why'd you take three or four weeks? Really enjoy yourself, use your sick leave, and enjoy, you know, see something, learn something. Don't waste that. And so he was really unique— that attitude didn't exist in any firms in Boston, to say the least.

I worked for Moshe Safdie, and Kevin Lynch, and Richardson & Abbott. But then there was no work the end of the 80s, there was no work in Boston.

So Don [Paine] and I get this job in Honolulu. And they offered us the world to come to Honolulu. And that job ended in six months. In the meantime, they had started a transit system out there. And I was the only one on the whole island that had ever worked on one before, so immediately became involved. We were working with ZGF. We were laying out all the stations—that was how we started. And then we specifically did four stations. Then the project got killed, and then it restarted as the light rail, and I was involved in that version of it—that killed. And then it got restarted in the 2000s. And that's when Don really took over and designed all the prototype stations.

In the meantime, because of Metro days, they called me and asked me if I would go to Manila, to the Philippines to be the architect for a line down there with Mitsubishi.

*Schrag*

Who called you for that?

*Gallagher*

Well, some people from Metro, staff that I knew. To go down there to work for Mitsubishi. So I went by myself down there and ended up with about 25 local people working for me. And I designed all the stations, I've got a book, I drew every single station by hand. And they built it. We stayed for the whole contract. And it got really busy, so Don came down as well. And we ended up opening an office and doing a lot of the joint development work for that line after the trains were running.

And then before that ended, again, in Metro, people call me and wanted me to go to Tel Aviv with them to work on the both the Tel Aviv Red Line and the Jerusalem Blue Line. That was some people from Parsons, who had been DeLeuw Cather at the beginning of Metro – the design engineers – people I had known since the day I had started working. And I did that. So, in the 90s I was just kind of a migrant worker. We were flying all over the place and working everywhere.

And while I was in Tel Aviv, Metro again called. It was Hanan Kivett and Takis [Salpeas] who called and wanted to know if we could put a team together to do Dulles rail. And I said, Sure, we can do that. So that was kind of out of the blue. And we did it. We got about 20 people hired, and started that job.<sup>1</sup>

And we were commuting. I was commuting from Tel Aviv, Don was commuting from Manila. And we had no way to run an office, but the engineer running the job in Tel Aviv with me, said, I've got the way to do that. My daughter can do this for you. She still runs the office today.

*Schrag*

That's the office in Washington?

*Gallagher*

Here, yeah. So that's kind of that whole history. Okay, so that we landed back, that was 2000. Working with Metro, and we've had a contract or multiple contracts ever since.

*Schrag*

So just in that initial period of 1976 to 84, working for Weese, what are you doing? What were your duties?

---

<sup>1</sup> From Gallagher, July 27, 2021. Hanan Kivett who was Takis's right hand man. Hanan had worked for FRA when I started work - and he was the client for Harry Weese in the Union Station renovation - then he went to work for Harry - in LA on the Subway there. He worked with Takis on BART airport extensions and then came back to DC with Takis to lead Dulles Rail and hired us as the Architects. Hanan is still working with Takis but has 'retired' and still lives in DC. Takis is in San Jose working on the Big Bore Tunnel Bart line - and using all our drawings we developed for Tysons Tunnel.

*Gallagher*

Alright, that's the one of the best parts.

So I was there a month maybe working. And Harry, he would come in and out every few weeks—

*Schrag*

So he's based in Chicago? Was Stan Allen in Washington?

*Gallagher*

Stan Allen was there. Stan was the one that hired me.

*Schrag*

Okay, so but there was Washington office at that point?

*Gallagher*

Yeah, there were 30, 25 people.

*Schrag*

With Stan in charge?

*Gallagher*

Stan and [Robert J.] Jerry Karn.

And so, the month into the new job — there was a new station type coming up. And I don't know how I got picked, but Harry picked me. He said, I want to spend the day with you. So meet me at nine o'clock, 10 o'clock, whatever was in the conference room. And so I went in the conference room, and there was maybe two other people in the office with me. And he says, we got this new style. It's a shotgun station. We've never done one of these before, but it's what they do in Stockholm, and I want you to design it. And he's got out some pens and paper and started drawing some things. Then he goes, well let's go to lunch. So we went, and the lunch took about four hours and just filled up the napkins with little sketches. I can't believe I didn't keep all that stuff. And he said, All right, you know what to do. I'll be back in three weeks or something. And if you have any questions, just call me.

And so that's how it started. And so that's what I was going to show you first, was these drawings that I did, right out of school, and that got built. So that was my first real experience with Harry. And he was he was really good at that stuff, teaching. Because he would work in a big scale, but down the corner, he would do the little details of how things would work. And that's how he thought, you know, he thought, all extremes at the same time. So it was really very educational. I was one of the real lucky ones. Because not everybody in the office got to spend a lot of time with him like that. I still can't believe it —It just changed my whole life.

His whole attitude and that office. It was a really hard working office, but it was very loose at the same time. We all would go out for beer at like three and four in the afternoon, a little place across the street.

*Schrag*

Where were the offices?

*Gallagher*

In the Metro building! We were in the Metro building. The whole seventh floor was the design team. So Parsons—Parsons was DeLeuw, Cather actually originally—and Harry Weese had that whole floor. We had one end and they had the other end. They had a lot more people than we did. And that was the whole team—everything was done there. And so it was very simple. We'd all just go to each other's offices and sit down with the chief architects and the engineers. We'd all

just—it was a very relaxed and so easy to work. The camaraderie of the whole group was just terrific, both social and working, working hard.

*Schrag*

And was that—was Sprague Thresher still there?

*Gallagher*

Sprague was there.

*Schrag*

On the WMATA side.

*Gallagher*

Yes. And then [Emanuel] Manny Mevorah took his place. Who else? Bob O'Neill was head of engineering, who remained a really great friend. He just passed away. And the engineers, some of those engineers, I still see them socially. One guy in particular, a mechanical guy. I make him work for us. But he still knows more than anybody else. I drag him into a lot of these projects.

*Schrag*

At that point, again, obviously, with the shotgun stations—is that Forest Glen or Wheaton?

*Gallagher*

Forest Glen. Both of them.

*Schrag*

You're taking the prototype and adapting it to particular conditions. And was that like, a lot of your work in the 70s? And early 80s?

*Gallagher*

Well, no, that lasted maybe six, eight months, nine months. Okay. It was done. Okay. And then I moved on to something else.

*Schrag*

I'm just saying in Metro in general, like the years you were spending at least working on Metro, what were there other kinds of work that was being done in the office?

*Gallagher*

The major things were the new stations. Yeah. We spent probably two years on that whole line out to Glenmont. All those stations. We had, like five different alignments we studied. It was an elevated alignment out there. It was an underground. And there was one on grade partly, and so a bunch of studies were done for all that. And then there were meetings, and then they picked the underground version. And that's when I got that station. And so that was going on.

The Green Line was going on at the same time, same kind of thing. There was a group of people working on the Green Line. And the end of the Orange Line was at the same time too.

At some point, and you can tell, really tell the difference. Harry was very involved in the early stations downtown, and the Forest Glen, that type. But just a couple of years after that—well, I don't know what year it was maybe 1980.

Stan had gone back to Chicago, and Jerry Karn had taken over the office. And Jerry and Harry had a conflict of design. Jerry wanted to run the design. And it's Harry's office. I think Harry had just kind of had it with Jerry, and Jerry, I think, understood that. He just thought he was going to take over the office. Do you know this whole story?

Schrag

No.

Gallagher

It's an incredible story. Jerry and a group of seven decided they were going to take over the office. On a weekend, like on a Friday, he—his secretary here had gone to work in the Chicago office—and he got her to get some files out of Chicago. And he packed up stuff in our office and took seven people with him and said, I've got a new firm, and we're going to take over the Metro work. Jerry had just a wonderful way dealing with the office and staff. Actually, he was very similar to Harry I that respect. He was full of energy and always a positive force on everyone around him.

Monday morning, Harry was in the office. He said to the staff, you guys are the ones doing all the work, not Jerry Karn. And we want to continue on as we are. The staff was pulled into the fighting between the two. Metro came in the office when neither were there and said – you are the ones with the knowledge – what do you want to do. We, the staff, all went out to the Dubliner, the bar by Union Station, the whole office staff. And we had just a knockdown drag out fight for about six hours trying to figure out what we wanted to do, because we needed to all agree. And I was sort of the leader of the Let's stay with Harry, because this is a Harry design. He's the legacy. And I like Jerry Karn a lot, but it wasn't—I didn't think it was his place to take the take over the work. Metro made the two teams compete for the job. Each did a proposal – ours was an inch thick of paper. And eventually Harry got the Metro project and Jerry got several of the other projects in the office including the Evening Star Building on Pennsylvania Ave. That all seemed fair in the end.

Harry did the stations that we all know downtown, but others did the shoe box stations (a nickname for them) out, like West Falls Church, and East Falls Church. They're sort of boxy and square. And that changed the design, without—not intentionally, but just had a different sense about it, which wasn't nearly as good as Harry's, in my opinion. And as Harry pulled back, the legacy of a lot of those stations that were not as great as Harry's. You can look at the system and you can tell who did what.

Schrag

I'd like to get your opinion on this. Because I the Commission of Fine Arts, I think didn't really understand how varied the system had to be. That's sort of my argument is that at some point, Weese just tells them, oh, yeah, all the stations will be the same. But he immediately starts adapting the design to different circumstances. Center platform, side platform, two entrance, one entrance, rock, concrete, all of these things. So you have them, obviously, the very dramatic differences, like the shotgun stations, you've got the outdoor stations, you've got the simplified vaults, in Connecticut Avenue.

Gallagher

So now, I want to explain that. That's a key one, because Dupont was built in rock, and it has the coffer like the downtown stations. And Harry had a fit when he realized what had happened, because it didn't represent the structure. To him good architecture was structural. Those downtown underground stations are structural, you know, he used the coffer to not have so much concrete in there and use the ribs and so on. Dupont didn't need that, because it was precast. So he wanted the precast to look like its structure. So every station after Dupont has the precast structure, and it looks like the precast structure, what's needed to hold it up. So that's why it's simplified.

The people who said it was because of money, because—it was not at all. It was because Harry wanted the structure to be real. And he didn't want anything fake. I still have problems with my own staff, who wanted to put some “decoration” into these stations. But he wanted them to be clean and simple as they can be. And so that's why that change in the vault.

*Schrag*

When was that? Do you have any idea like when?

*Gallagher*

I was there. It had to be—I walked all those tunnels during construction, the whole Red Line all the way from Dupont north. It had to be and 77, 78. Something like that, in that range, when that took place.

*Schrag*

What I'd like to—again, people have lots of opinions, but I'd like to get your aesthetic judgment on that whole range. You know, so you like those Connecticut Avenue stations: Woodley and up on Connecticut Avenue. Not so big a fan of East Falls Church, West Falls Church.

*Gallagher*

Right, right.

*Schrag*

You know, again, I know what other people like do you have other like favorites or less favorite variants on the Metro?

*Gallagher*

Well, so Harry's canopy was brilliant, the gullwing. Because by making a tube like that, you can span really long distances. You have columns 50 feet apart with that tube, because they're self-supporting. And then—I think this probably was probably because of money. They started doing the flat roofs and some of those other versions of it, but I don't think any of them were nearly as successful as the gullwing canopies.

One of his best friends was Saarinen. They had grown up together and studied with Eero Saarinen's father Eliel—at Cranbrook. I'm sure that was an influence too because of Dulles Airport and just the idea of those wings. I was really a fan of the gullwing and so sorry to see that changed. And it's random. Like you go out the Red Line, there's a flat roof and then a gullwing. And Jerry had to do some things to do with those flat roofs and the triangular—I think that was Jerry that created the alternative canopies – probably at Metro's direction.

And then there was a station like Huntington which was really oddball. Have you seen Huntington? It's got a flat roof, but it's got these wings that come out with the circles in them to support it. And that was done because it was in the woods, and it was an amazing station when it was built, and now it's terrible because the woods are all gone. But Harry certainly approved that one. Designed by Luca Gori. So multiple people were able to contribute to the design over the years.

*Schrag*

And Anacostia. That's one with the other—

*Gallagher*

That was Harry. Yeah, yeah.

*Schrag*

What do you what do you think of that? I mean, that's such an interesting exception.

*Gallagher*

Well, he wanted that vaulted ceiling, that vaulted look, and it was too shallow to get the look. But if you turned it this way, they were much more shallow. I thought it was a brilliant little solution.

That's my thing. I really like it. And you don't really see it until you get down there and you're looking at it. Now that was great surprise.

So some people played with these vaults too. Smithsonian, I don't know if you know, Arthur Cotton Moore did the final working drawings.

*Schrag*

I didn't know that. Okay, that's the very rectangular coffers.

*Gallagher*

Yes. Yeah, he did not use the criteria of the three-inch radius on the coffers. And really that's there so you can pull the forms out. I mean, there's a logical reason for that. To pull out that tight radius was would have been much more difficult. And nobody caught it; everybody checks all these things. And when it was built, we were all like, where did that come from? And out of all people, Arthur Cotton Moore is the one that loved all these circles and all this stuff.

So, we would do the basic drawings, the full set of drawings, but they were not buildable. I mean, you could build it from it, but contractors wanted more details. We did the general plans and then that got sent to design build—basically, you would call it today—is how it happened. But our general plans were really all detailed out. You knew how big the beams were, where every light was and all that stuff.

*Schrag*

So then some individual architects like Moore—

*Gallagher*

Yeah.

*Schrag*

Would not do it quite— Do you know if he did other stations? I'm just interested because he comes back up with the escalator canopy story.

*Gallagher*

Oh, yeah. Well, you know, that whole story.

*Schrag*

Well, no, I'm working. Yeah. But that's part of what—

*Gallagher*

So I don't know the whole story either. But I know that he volunteered. That canopy. And everybody was like, I don't know. It's in Fine Arts Commission said that. I don't know all those details. There's lots of opinions about that.

So they had a competition, and we entered that competition. And we did something very similar to what won, but I was very pleased with that, the canopy that they did select, because it seems it really does fit to the system. It's part of the system and now it represents the system. And I think it's a nice icon.

I don't know the factual history, whether the Fine Arts Commission said no canopies to begin with or not. There was all this discussion about why there were no canopies. And I know Harry drew some canopies. But I've never seen them. I don't know where those drawings are.

*Schrag*

I'm not sure I've seen them either. Because the notes that I have was he was in Hamburg and Stockholm. And the escalators were open to the sky and getting rained on and snowed on and I've never—I mean, one thing that Ivo Karadimov told me was that these days, I think this is the

engineering standard with the Society of Mechanical Engineers, that you have to cover it. I've not seen anything conclusive that says, it really reduces maintenance cost much. I don't know if you have?

*Gallagher*

No, I don't know, I just assume it does. But I don't know either. I have no idea. But I do think it helps them in the winter, because I've seen those escalators with two feet of snow on them. And having to go down there and dig those out by hand is just a real pain. Like Dupont. I've watched those guys trying to shovel that out. So the canopy seems just like a good practical solution.

*Schrag*

My question is what makes Metro Metro? Because not every station has to look like Judiciary Square. That's sort of there from the beginning, right? Even if the Fine Arts Commission didn't quite know that. On the other hand, there are some things you can do to Metro, certainly with materials, but also even with shapes where you begin to say, I'm not sure this is the vocabulary anymore. So do you have any just general arguments to make about how much is too much variation?

*Gallagher*

Well, I think when we were doing Dulles, that was a big thing, because a lot of new stations. And we never got around to designing the canopies, because they wanted us to use the New Air, which is New York Avenue, which had just been built.

*Schrag*

New Air?

*Gallagher*

New era canopy. That was done by AECOM. New York Avenue. And then there's two more out in Morgan Boulevard. There's those two out there. And I think that's interesting, but it's very much not what Harry would have done. I don't think.

He had this problem with all the rust. This is another Harry story. The rust in Chicago with the L. It was always rusting. And it always bothered him that he could see all the rust. He didn't want anything that would look like rust or could look like rust. So everything is brown. The Metro brown came from hiding rust. So all the doors are brown. And the bronze is sort of a similar color.

With the bronze it was very intentional. And there's little great story about that. Doug [Tilden] gave this lecture with me for the 25 year award. He was in the office in Chicago while I was in Washington. He had come up with something—when he was young, he came up with some kind of finish you could put on that bronze so it wouldn't stain and would always look the same. And Harry, just—what are you doing? That's the absolute wrong thing. We want to see handprints. We want to see where people walk, you want to see that bronze color change. Harry was really into that level of detail. And Doug tells that story. He really got yelled at for his suggestion to seal up that bronze. But I went astray here on something.<sup>2</sup>

*Schrag*

We were talking about, again, the variations, and what makes things too different. And the materials are very much part of that.

---

<sup>2</sup> From Gallagher, July 27, 2021. Doug Tilden worked for Harry Weese many years, and was part of the original Metro Design Team. We worked for Doug on the Honolulu Transit system for a number of years. He then returned to DC to head the Bechtel team on Dulles Rail. Then on to NYC to led the Grand Central Station - new lower level platform project - a major accomplishment. He's now retired in South Carolina. Doug, Robert Bruegmann and I gave the Harry Weese Lecture at the AIA Convention when Harry was awarded the 25 Year Award for Metro.



I don't know if we want to skip ahead to the 2013 Bethesda prototype. Or—trying to think if there's—maybe we should get to that, because that's going to be again, a major part of the story is 2013.

They put out that video, of the glass, steel and no more Metro bronze. And where are you at that point, are you? You're obviously here in Washington, but are you doing work for—?

*Gallagher*

We had four or five contracts going on at the same time

*Schrag*

For Metro?

*Gallagher*

For Metro. Yeah. So we were always involved.

Ed Riley had just left and just retired, and Ivo had taken over. Ivo was a little green when that happened. He was part of that. And he would admit that I'm sure now. But he was trying to give it a new face, and so on.

So lots of people were talking about this new look including Tom Luebke at [the Commission of] Fine Arts who is one of my classmates from grad school,

*Schrag*

I didn't know that.

*Gallagher*

So we talk a lot on the side about stuff.

At that time, we were, gosh, I don't—I'd have to go through the files—we were on 10, at least 10 or 12 projects from Metro at the time. But we're also doing the Purple Line, the Red Line in Baltimore about that time. I was commuting a lot to Baltimore.

I'm trying to get back over here, spend more time in DC.

Bethesda, so they said, you know you need to do this. I had been giving lectures about the history of Metro and AIA tours. I was big on pushing Harry's principles - this was exactly contrary to his principles. Harry Weese principles for Metro. Are you familiar with all this stuff?

*Schrag*

Yes.

*Gallagher*

So this is what he told the Fine Arts Commission when they gave him the job. They liked the way he had spoken about it. And this goes also—that's one of his first sketches. This is the Weese office, this is all that background we just talked about. That's Harry, that's opening day, on the train. And then design, principles of design.

This is the basis of everything I ever did, was from the kit of parts basically, because they're all drawn, There's manuals of parts and pieces, and how they go together. And I think that's the simplicity of it is very clear. And that's why Forest Glen was, for me, it was just a real learning experience, how to put these pieces together in a different way.

And there's the golden rule of the eight foot four, you know about the eight foot four module?

*Schrag*

And that multiplies out to 600 feet.

*Gallagher*

Yes, exactly. 25 feet, and 50 feet, and so on. So everything's on the eight foot four, so that was a big thing. I'm still arguing to make them stay. We don't need to go through any of this. But I just talked about everything we just talked about.

So, Bethesda. When we got the job that's what was just given to us. With Claude [Engle]. We brought Claude in, because that we thought that was important. So that was one of those early sketches.

*Schrag*

I want to slow down a little. How did you even first find out that they're going to do the prototype? This is September 2013. You're showing this slide. So by September, I can't remember what month?

*Gallagher*

Oh, I don't know.

*Schrag*

But were you I guess my question is like, Did you just like read it in the newspaper like everyone else, or —

*Gallagher*

Oh, no. Everybody was talking about in Metro. It's still it's very clandestine over there in terms of everybody talks to everybody about everything. So I saw that and I thought, oh my god this is terrible. So of course, I said something to somebody. But we were busy doing other things. So I didn't I didn't go after that or anything. But because of our history with the with Metro—I mean, everybody knew that—they always refer to us. We are currently rewriting all the design guidelines for architecture.

*Schrag*

You're doing that now?

*Gallagher*

Yeah. So most of those projects come to us. Without me—we don't request them or anything. So all the good engineering consultant teams want us on their team, typically. So we're using all the teams. In fact, Ed Riley called me up. There's the big GEC [General Engineering Consultant] competition. He called him up the day after it was submitted, he said you won! I said, What do you mean? He said, You're on all the teams. So that was the kind of reputation we had.

I don't know, I don't even remember the first conversation about this. I just know what it looked like. And I'm sure—we were trying to be nice to Ivo, too—but there was a meeting where we were called over to talk about this at some point. And so I suggested right at that meeting, we said, you need to look at this in three versions of it.

One is just total historic, restore it to what it was.

The second one is— well somewhere in between historic and completely new, the third one is— do something radical, and change, really change it and make it a different station.

And the middle one is to work what new pieces that need to be introduced, figure out to how to do that correctly. And do that. So we did two versions of this. It was limited to one version pretty quickly, introducing new elements that could have a new language to them. And Harry would respect that. If you're changing something, make it look like it's not original. If you're, like—trying to think of one good example. So when you have a historic building, you either you exactly copy it, or you insert something that is definitely not part of that historic group. And I have mixed feelings I can go back and forth on —

*Schrag*

Well, that's exactly what I'm interested in. Because if you're if you're trying to, again, preserve—Well, certainly, if you're trying to preserve Mount Vernon, you're not trying to introduce new elements. If you've got air conditioning, you hide it under the wainscoting or in the fireplace or something. If you're trying to do—I'm trying to think of, again, a historic site that might need some renovation have a lot of people moving through it. But still you're trying to preserve the history.

That's one thing. It just seems to me that with Metro, given the massive numbers of people who've been through, given the safety concerns, given the budgetary concerns, then maybe that wish to preserve history doesn't get the same priority as it would in a historic site or museum.

*Gallagher*

Well, yes and no. I'm a stickler for the old stations. And I've been arguing with them for years still, and I don't know if I've won or not, that they have to maintain those glass escalators, because they've been replacing all the escalators, and they wanted to make them stainless steel, instead of glass. The glass is actually cheaper. And the maintenance departments claims they have to replace the glass. Well, I watched. That breaks once every 10 years or something. That is so minimal breakage on that glass. So it needs to stay glass, period. And as far as I'm concerned, in the in the historic stations, and escalators should stay bronze.

*Schrag*

So what is a historic station?

*Gallagher*

I define it as the downtown underground stations and the early gullwing stations. As you move out—but any of the vaulted stations I would consider sort of at this point, not just downtown. But they've all had things that got switched along the way as they were built. Is that kind of okay.

*Schrag*

You know, that just seems to me like one of the possibilities here would be to do some kind of triage because obviously, the stations that have been painted have—we'll get into that have you know—less value now than Judiciary Square, right. I think of Judiciary Square and Metro Center almost as league apart. I said that Ivo and Jeff Winstel. And they said, No, no, it's a system. And so I think there's maybe some room for debate about whether there are some stations that deserve more historic treatment than others.

*Gallagher*

I would have kept the all the original downtown stations as historic. But you're right, Union Station is painted. And that's the worst one to paint, because the trains drag in all the dirt from the from the yard. And so that's going to get dirty immediately. And I haven't looked at it lately, but I'm sure it is just filthy again. And now you really see the dirt. I was really upset. I got in trouble, because I wrote something in the paper. But everybody at Metro was like, it's okay.

*Schrag*

Yeah, I don't think anyone is defending that decision. So it's easy enough. But I guess my question—to go back to the Bethesda plan—is what you had said was that you were not insisting on preserving everything from the 70s and 80s. So how do you balance that?

*Gallagher*

Well, I think I can do that by drawings better than just talking. Because as we went through that process—This goes back up again, I hope. We didn't even consider the glass. But things sort of creep into this. It's just the three options, A, B, and C, that we looking at. And then we just started in on each piece. We created issues and goals. And we just said this is all background stuff of

what we were doing. But this is the lighting that we get into this. We thought that that everything should be preserved as much as possible. But look at that. It's a mess.

*Schrag*

Yeah, so we're looking at photos from 2013. And the tiles, the ceiling tiles are all discolored.

*Gallagher*

So we went through each section of the station. This is the entry. And we're talking about organizing this more.

*Schrag*

The farecard machines, the vending machine.

*Gallagher*

So instead of a sort of a real hodgepodge put this into some type of system. The problem was that they kept coming up with different types of machines and things. So everybody agreed to put it into a wall system, that would just clean it up and just simplify it a whole lot more. And so that was one of the things that that happened. And this is kind of figuring out how to do that.

So we took each element like that, and worked with it. So that's that space. That's a cleaned up space. And we did a whole lot of alternatives with this as well as part of that exercise. But as we go through, you can see, this is another version of it. We were looking at that.

So we're preserving the basic elements in all these. The curved, the curved cove at the top. The quarry tiles. We were trying to preserve all the basic elements that Weese had started with. I don't think he ever expected all these things to be junked up like that. The same thing with the mezzanine. We were trying to clean it up.

The view from the kiosk was always critical down to the station. But it all got blocked with the telephone booths and other things. And we were looking at the kiosk and how to redo the kiosk. That was an interesting part of this whole thing because the at one point, they wanted the kiosk to be much bigger, because they wanted people to be able to get in there, the guy wanted more space, but it became a clubhouse. And so everybody was upset because the guy would never come out. And they wanted to shrink it back down at this point. So that one guy could be in there but he would be out talking to people more than in this little fortress. We looked at doing a smaller kiosk, and they're actually building one. Very much like the one prototype we came up with. Not sure it's in this set, but there's final rendering of it. So we kind of redid that kiosk again.

We're trying to clear up this space. So you can see down through here. And looking at the maps, and the lighting, all this has to do with the lighting and circulation. There is a bunch of circulation diagrams. That's what kind of was there, or that was there. The same thing with these, these extra posts in the in the stations for the signage. So we thought that should be integrated into the original system. So this demonstrates—but so we were putting them on the pylons, attaching them to the pylons.

*Schrag*

Public information displays.

*Gallagher*

Yeah, instead of having its own separate sign. And then we were redoing these, just kind of making something simpler. That could work on all the stations. And all that stuff at the end of the platform was just trying to bury it.

You can see the new signage. So we did all the signage, and this, and the lighting.

There's, I guess, more. So we're trying to cover that up a little bit and make it more part of the — that's those ETEC [Emergency Tunnel Evacuation Cart] things that they can put down and put

them back on the tracks, if there's no power. You can pick this thing up, put it on the tracks and push people down the tunnel. For escaping. And they're sitting on all the platforms now, which is just kind of funky.

I'm skipping over a lot of this, I was trying to get to the actual—there's all this detail. We did these studies of movement, and sight lines through the stations, and how big they should be, how many lines are should be on these things and different shapes. And then the actual flow of people in and out.

This is from Harry: you want to come in on the right side, you want the machines on the right side, you want to leave on the left side. So that there's no conflict of people. We're trying to help keep that organized. Some people on the way out would want to come to Addfare. Just doing all kinds of diagrams that would help.

But that level of thought was where Harry was. I mean, this was really so well thought out. You know the fare machines. It was on the right and how you would use those and then generally go in on the right and come out on the left. This was to do with clustering things together. The fare machines. So this is one of the other options So the portals—all these pieces are critical. The railings, the portals. So then this is this kiosk. And we were doing the slope on top because they don't want flat roofs on anything. So you can't put a bomb. We can't put a package on top of anything. They want everything sloped, which is kind of funky.

This last one—I didn't put it in here. I have it over here though. I think that's important. So this is what we were taking out to the public. These images and the public. That's the old, and that's the new and they're actually doing this kiosk now. Very similar to this.

This gets more into the details. They wanted to upgrade the fare machines and the railings. And I think my attitude was you keep the station down below as much of the bronze as you can. But as you come up and out—because they'd already replaced most of the escalators with stainless steel escalators, and the canopy is stainless—so if those two work together, then maybe you introduce a little bit of stainless of new things in the in the mezzanine area, like the fare machines, because the old dark ones, they do look dark and old. So I say okay, brighten this up with some stainless in here.

But as you go down into the station, it kind of disappears. But the idea that the Kiosk is much more glassy, transparent and we designed this so a wheelchair could get up and talk to this guy. And there's the new lighting. We did this through everything. This is what the newer, lighter things would look like. And this is what was. And this is what we were doing because we want to open that view up from the kiosk down through here. We pull the Addfare machines apart. And actually, these are supposed to disappear sometime in the future. I don't know if you know that. The Addfare machines. I don't know what they're doing exactly. But they're trying to get rid of those machines.

*Schrag*

Just bill people. I mean, I guess put the different fare collection.

*Gallagher*

Yeah. And they added that extra post for the signs, and just get rid of that post and make it a clean— And these I think were stainless steel, just something saying that this is new. And these, I guess were stainless as well. So there's some introduction of some new elements to the station. They look a little bit different than but they're crisp and clean. And I think that's it, this was cleaning this up. And this is what we were doing with the pylons.

This also was working with Claude, as we were installing new lights on top of this pylons, which he ended up doing. He had to put a little cap on those pylons to get the depth for the light.

*Schrag*

I've got a few follow-up questions here.

One is, you've mentioned the concerns about bombs, the emergency exits, like it seems that there are a few new demands on the system that were not anticipated in 1968, or whatever we're dating it. And then it also strikes me that it is a somewhat minimalist design that Weese created, and that they are for more challenging to preserve that there aren't nooks and crannies to tie things into. Was that fair?

*Gallagher*

Oh, yeah. But it's also Metro's attitude towards all those new things that caused a lot of problems. They didn't want outside trades (cable, internet) people, that weren't Metro people to go into the interspaces because all that stuff could have been hidden. All those wires going down on the platform, with those boxes, could have been put off the end, inside the service rooms. So I think I would have had a big fight. I wasn't here when those decisions were made, I would have fought to keep that stuff out of the public spaces —Ed Riley was running architecture then. And he was a little bit weak in that sense. And John Thomas was the chief engineer with a very strong personality. So John Thomas got his way more than Ed Riley. But because of Ed, John got to meet Tom Luebke, at CFA which gave John a new appreciation for the stations. In the end, this all worked out that respect for other people's opinions helped keep the stations from being destroyed. John was very involved in our "station of the future" — Bethesda.

*Schrag*

Which are those canopies?

*Gallagher*

Up at Columbia Heights. You've seen those? They call them the turtle. They're like a canopy, but they have a wall around them with glass. That was the first canopies that they ever did. They're not great. And they're still there. You should go look at them.

*Schrag*

Yes, probably.

*Gallagher*

But architecture and engineering were at war a lot of the time. But we worked for both. And I would like to keep Ed informed of what we were doing because he's the chief architect and we're architects even when we were working on the engineering side. Well that didn't sit so well. Personalities. We learned our lesson, not to put ourselves in the middle the hard way. I got a call from engineering on a Friday afternoon — telling me if I ever told the architects what we were doing, I would never have a job again!

Anyway, we had lunch the following Monday with the engineers and we got it all sorted out. And we all stayed friends. I'm meeting John, the former Chief Engineer tomorrow for lunch. Most important to the organization were the personal relationships which made all the difference in the ultimate design of the system. Metro has always been like a big family — but now it is so big, it's hard to keep all those personal relationships going.

*Schrag*

Yeah. So I was looking through my notes with my interview with [William] Lam. And he's thought that Thresher worked very hard to keep architecture equal. And then after that, it was not the same after Thresher's retirement.

*Gallagher*

Well, I wouldn't say that. It changed at some point. But well, change really changed when Harry lost his contract, because Harry Weese and the engineers were totally separate. So now we work for the engineers. In fact, that's an odd thing. When we got the Dulles job, we came back to Washington. Harry Weese's office was around but he had already passed away. They asked me if I would open up the Harry Weese office again in Washington. And I said, well, I would have

loved to have done that. But we already have the Metro job. And it doesn't really make a lot of sense to me.

And that's when they sold it out against to Gensler, right after that. So that was 1999 or 2000.

*Schrag*

So when did Weese lose his contract?

*Gallagher*

1999 or 2000? Right at the right around there. I wasn't here. It was in the late 90s. Okay. Well, he had passed away, I think, when that happened, there wasn't much work. But all of a sudden, there was Dulles rail, and Blue Line extensions and all that stuff coming out. So that's when they called us. Harry had been gone a few years. But that's when things really changed – when Weese's firm lost that contract, that was the last time there was a GAC – General Architectural Consultant – totally equal to the GEC – General Engineering Consultant. After that, the architects worked for the engineers – which makes it a completely different playing field. Our status has been greatly reduced and our power to control the aesthetics of the system.

So Sprague and then Manny Mevorah. Oh, he's passed away now. But he was he was Sprague's assistant. Okay. So when Sprague retired, and he became in charge, and then I was gone. So I don't know what will happen is that timeframe, but when I came back was Ed Riley. But at that same time the engineers now owned the system. All the architects worked for them. The GAC was gone. I think this is why Ed did not get along with the engineers. He was used to running the show and suddenly, everyone was working for the engineers. This is when all the wires cables and other disasters started happening to the stations.

*Schrag*

Yeah, maybe we should talk about the lighting now. Because again, I've talked to Claude Engle, but there are mentions in the newspaper of lighting study after lighting study, going back to early 2000s. I think maybe.

*Gallagher*

Yes, we ran all those studies. Actually, I had worked with Bill Lam back in the 70s and 80's trying to fix the system, making the lighting better. There were many experiments back then. In one case I was on top of a fare machine holding up a lighting fixture. The machine was outside and had bird jell on top – which caused me to fall off and break my arm. That was quiet a night! On the lighting teams Metro had us set it up. And we had interviews with all these ten different lighting teams, architects with lighting companies. And then each gave a proposal, and I had all those. I'm not sure where they are. They're in a box here somewhere. Well, there's proposals. And Roger Lewis got involved and do you know Roger?

*Schrag*

I've read his work in the [Washington] Post.

*Gallagher*

Yeah. So Roger got involved. He was on the jury, I think with us, and there was a huge interview process for each of these teams. And then it died. And don't ask me, I don't know why it died. It was one of those things that they didn't really have any money to do something or something.

And it's lucky. I mean, they're so lucky that they didn't do anything. Because—and I always argue that at some point in the future—I didn't know LED—I knew lighting would come up to the to the level that was needed to fix this without doing any intervention.

But there were all sorts of interventions, like mechanical arms that are posts and columns with lights, like lights shining up on the walls and that kind of thing, just all sorts of interventions, all these teams were doing.

And at the same time, they had a competition about enlarging the stations, and they got a bunch of heavy duty architects, I mean, famous architects, but didn't really know anything about transit. They came up with some really interesting concepts, but almost none of it was buildable because they didn't really understand it. Like punching through all the walls and making spaces outside the station boxes. Just all sorts of stuff. And somewhere I've got a lot of that here.

But the lighting thing was—it was just really lucky that didn't happen. That was under Ed Riley. But I'm just so happy that they waited long enough that they got the perfect solution.

*Schrag*

Yeah, so that was sort of my impression from Engle again—was that that a lot of the technology he ended up using had not existed ten or fifteen years before.

*Gallagher*

The originals, it's the original idea, original system works just fine.

So then another thing was like speakers, we went through this whole thing with speakers. Because the original sound system was in the vault and in the concrete. But unfortunately, those rusted up there, the wiring got bad. So you couldn't really fix it easily. When the system opened they would play symphonies in this stations when we were working on them. It was an amazing sound system. But I don't know how well it did for voice. I don't really remember it being a problem.

But when I came back, it was just a mess. So they stopped using all those speakers. And they first put some speakers on the walls, I guess visible, then they put speakers behind the parapets. And that didn't work.

We did this whole study with Bose, and figured out exactly how to do this. And Bose did a really nice job designing them so they fit on the pylons. And it was all thought out. And I go down to the station one day and the maintenance guys were installing speakers. And the maintenance and design departments just hadn't talked to each other over there. And so our project just completely died because the maintenance guys were already installing speakers, which still don't work.

So there's a real problem with Metro being open to itself. I mean, yeah, there's the right hand and left hand not knowing what they're doing.

*Schrag*

That seems to be the story of the paint, and the lights, and a lot of things. The wiring.

*Gallagher*

The painting on the Union Station is the worst ever because we were working on it. We had the lighting ready to go for that station. And if the lighting had been put in, that would have absolutely not been necessary. I don't know if [Paul] Wiedefeld knew that or didn't know it or what. I think he just needed a headline, brighter stations or something.

*Schrag*

I'm not sure he signed off on that. I think it was some assistant general manager—is my understanding.

*Gallagher*

Yeah. I don't know. He probably doesn't want that on his name. I don't know, but it really upset me. And architecture had no idea that was happening. Nobody did. I was coming back from Baltimore. And I saw it, and I called Ivo and I said, have you seen this? And I sent him pictures. I still have them. They had just started painting. And they made them stop. But what do you do when it's half-painted?



And Farragut was—I don't know if I was here with that got painted—but I was really upset with that too. A lot of people were. And again, I don't know how that could have happened. After that one the arch department laid down the law that nothing could be done in station without their approval – but that just has never worked. That has to come from the top down!

*Schrag*

So just to go back to the lighting for a second, because again that's—well first of all how do you feel about how it turned out? Maybe we should start at the end go back. Like go to Metro Center today and it's—

*Gallagher*

It's just so, so much better. I mean it had become an embarrassment of how dark it was and how dirty it was. Yeah, and they still haven't cleaned anything, I don't think. But they need a maintenance program. That's just so critical. Maintenance probably— When the stations open originally, they would hose, power wash them every so often. And I don't know that they have power washed them in years. Now I know they had no money, but they have money now. You have to start and just keep doing it. Maybe it's a 10-year cycle to get through the whole system or something. But that, and the lights need to be cleaned.

It makes so much difference. It's welcoming and warm, and it's not scary and dark like it was. But it is getting dirty really quickly again. That was probably the biggest problem with the entire system, the lighting in my opinion. Just aesthetically speaking and making people feel safe.

*Schrag*

So how did—my understanding is that Claude Engle Sr. and Claude Engle Jr. contacted WMATA and maybe Ivo put them in touch with you. Or do you have a sequence of events there?

*Gallagher*

That's a good question. We've known each other a long time. A guy that broke away from Claude Engle, John Coventry Lighting, worked with us— since, I mean, for years—on all the Metro stuff. We did all the Rosslyn lighting and other these thing, like the Bicycle Transit Center at Union Station with John. For our projects, we used John Coventry. And John decided he was going to retire or something.

Somewhere along the way, I met Claude Jr.—young Claude—and Sr. And I don't know, I honestly don't know. I could go back and try to figure that out. I can ask Claude. Does he know?

What I think happened was we ran that lighting competition in the mid 00's. We met all the teams and interviewed them. I think that's when we first met – both of the Engles. That was during the Ed Riley days – I'll check that out with Claude.

*Schrag*

Well, it's a little vague, because there's you. There's him. There's Ivo, and I just wasn't sure. You know, you all know each other. I wasn't sure sort of who contacted whom, when. But one thing he said was, he had not worked with Lam, and that you have some of Lam's documents that you shared with him. Is that correct?

*Gallagher*

Yeah. Yeah.

*Schrag*

I'm interested in how that Metro history gets passed on to someone who had not been there.

*Gallagher*

Definitely, he and I would sit and talk about that stuff. Because it was so obvious to me, it was such a great system. And that that LEDs could solve that problem – not that we knew that then – just that something will come along. So how that started, I don't know.

We're good friends, he comes down and we eat over here on 17th Street a lot. But I don't know, but we've had a lot of—for some reason, we have always had lighting consultant friends. But I didn't know Claude, early on. I knew when we came back, I don't know who did Dulles rail with us. I think I think John Coventry probably did. But I don't know, I can't answer that.

*Schrag*

I guess part of my question there. And this is for historians, very important is the lack of an archive. The Weese papers in Chicago are very detailed, but you know, only go so far. There's some stuff at GW that various people smuggled out of WMATA over the years, but there's no WMATA archive. And so you know, when Engle is trying to be true to Lam's design, he turns to you for those—I think—documents, not to Ivo or Winstel or someone there, because they just don't have them.

*Gallagher*

Yeah, that's true.

*Schrag*

And so what is what kind of archive do you have? I guess, is my question.

*Gallagher*

It's mostly here.

*Schrag*

Yeah. In your head?

*Gallagher*

Somewhere I had the original, they actually build a concrete arch in the field. But have you seen that?

*Schrag*

Yeah, the two-coffer deep.

*Gallagher*

They lit it. Bill Lam did. And so I kept up with Bill Lam all these years too. Because I was in Boston for a while, eight years. As I remember this, Bill Lam and I—I don't know how—got in touch, we got in touch about something. Maybe it was Union Station. Some project. I called Bill Lam. And he goes, Well, I'm still going solve that Metro problem. And he said, I got some ideas. So he came down two or three times, and they developed some prototypes for redoing all the lighting. But it wasn't—LEDs were just still on the edge there. And he had some other ideas of lighting, how to light it better. And he was not going to give up. But I know he died before the lighting started, the actual lighting. And when he was gone I felt really bad. He had sent down prototype full size mockups – and we went out and tried them. He called me a lot, once a week and would talk for an hour. I still feel so bad, he had called me and I had not called him back – when he died.

I don't know. I don't know how I met Claude, to tell you the truth. I think we were both working on one of the teams on something. We can figure it out. I think.

*Schrag*

I'd be interested in it. Again, because what what Claude said was is there were some documents showing Lam's intentions. I think he said 10 Lamberts, or there was some measurement that really helped him understand what he was aiming for. And then once he had that, he said, Okay, here's how I go from a fluorescent to an LED solution for that level.

But you have to know what you're trying to achieve them. And it's to me, it's analogous to what you were saying about the Weese principles. That if you know what your goal is, then you say, Well, here's how we do it with present technology. Here's how we do it with within our budget. But for example, when you were saying how the sightlines were so important to Weese, and then you're moving the machinery on the mezzanine, right? in service to that principle. Do I have that right?

*Gallagher*

Yes.

*Schrag*

Okay. So that, to me is very analogous to what Engle was doing with the lighting. He says, Okay, I understand what Lam was trying to achieve, in part because you gave him some of Lam's documents.

*Gallagher*

Yeah, I'd have to dig around to see what I actually gave him. I don't know. We were all kind of upset with those up lights. And we had—at Bethesda, we had a version where we were trying to get rid of those. But at the end, they were already all installed everywhere.

*Schrag*

On the mezzanines?

*Gallagher*

On the mezzanines. Yeah. And that was a reasonable solution. Harry Weese might not have liked that. But it does work okay. And it was really difficult to light those mezzanines.

The original lighting was on top of the kiosk and on top of the telephone booths, and some up lights, just nothing else. There were no down lights anywhere. And they added a bunch of down lights everywhere. The hanging lights got rid of all those.

*Schrag*

So why don't you think Weese would have approved? You don't think Weese would have approved, just because it's an intrusion on the vault?

*Gallagher*

Yeah. Yeah. But that precedent got set. I think it's Friendship Heights has an elevator lobby. One end is all elevators. There's an elevator lobby, a vaulted lobby. I think it has hanging up lights in it. Which he would have been part of that. Bill Lam probably did that. I don't know. I never asked him. But the precedent had been set for that.

But the mezzanines were very difficult to light. That was one of the things Bill Lam was working on. And that's where he had these arms that would come up from the front of the side of the parapets. It was before LEDs. And this was before Bethesda. So what year was that? 2013?

*Schrag*

2013 was where they released the Station of the Future idea. And then I guess 2014—or I guess it was late 2013—when you'd started doing your work

*Gallagher*

It was prior to that Bill Lam was doing these studies. It must have been 12 or 10. I can kind of figure that out probably. He was driving everybody at Metro crazy because he would come down and go over there. And say, I got this solution! But he wasn't hired by anybody. He was just doing it on his own. And he was he was such a character. And he really worked on this, Metro was one of his big projects. Yeah, he wanted to fix it.

*Schrag*

I think he told me it was he thought it was the most important thing he did.

*Gallagher*

And he wanted it fixed. Yeah. I'm really sorry he didn't live for the LEDs.

*Schrag*

So for the record. I mean, I know what I think of them, but you think they've sort of achieved Lam's vision?

*Gallagher*

Totally. Yeah. Oh, totally. Yeah. It's, it's remarkable. They didn't need to do anything. Just no intervention at all. Just replace the lamps, basically.

*Schrag*

Well, I mean, that's sort of the amazing thing. Lam's design was all based on reflectors, reflected fluorescent lights. Engle had to translate all of that to lenses. He's not trying to make anything that the untutored eye would see. To me it's a very successful story of preservation.

*Gallagher*

With new technology.

*Schrag*

With new technology. Exactly.

*Gallagher*

Visually, you don't see the difference. You would never know.

*Schrag*

So it strikes me again here that what I'm trying to do is in this talk, is think about both some successes and some failures. Obviously, no one likes to paint on the vaults. No one is really going to promote the 2013 version of Bethesda as the radical stainless idea. The lighting strikes me—I think everyone would say—that's a big success. The canopies again, not part of the original design, but very respectful of that and I think you'd agree on there

*Gallagher*

Totally.

*Schrag*

I don't know if you care about this, but to me, the redesign of the map—again, they're going back to the original designer, but keeping—Wyman as I understand it was trying to keep as much as possible of his original map while bringing in the Silver Line and the other changes.

*Gallagher*

I'm blanking on his name—the original graphic designer?

*Schrag*

Well, Vignelli did the graphics and then Wyman did the map.

*Gallagher*

Vignelli came a few times. And I was on a panel with him. When Ed was in charge, Ed Riley. And he, he passed away, about the same time as Bill Lam, I think.

*Schrag*

And you know, one of the things that's interesting to me there is that to do to like, keep the graphics, right. I mean, some of it is a lot of work, but just to like, print the Metro arrow on the signs, like, it doesn't cost any more. And yet, if you look at like farecards over the years, and signage and maps, like a lot of them just didn't even adhere to that.

*Gallagher*

Yeah, so a lot of stuff. I mean, but I don't really keep track of that. There's nobody from the architecture side looking at this. So that's a big problem with the train cars. You mentioned trains.

*Schrag*

Yes.

*Gallagher*

Did you know that that that the original train cars match the coffers?

*Schrag*

Yeah. So that's what I wanted to talk to you about.

*Gallagher*

Yeah. Because I brought that up. After I saw the new trains. I said, didn't anybody talk about this? And John Thomas said, oh, we didn't know that. That was his response to me. Nobody realized it. And I was like, oh, gosh/

They needed to have a system where someone—they run stuff, anything that's public —should run be run by a group of people or somebody. There needs to be a little—like the escalators, the glass escalators, because it's critical that you see through those and that the light can bounce come through those escalators. There's a bunch of things like that. Little, little things. They're not big things, just little things. But that makes the difference.

*Schrag*

Right, so the rail cars, as far as I can tell, there's nothing that the 7000 series preserves. And they say that. There's a Post story where they say, we're going for a new look.

*Gallagher*

But it has nothing to do with Metro. I mean, those little, tiny windows. I know why they did it. And I think it's a very silly thing. They beefed up those trains and made them heavier because of the accident, but heavier doesn't solve a lot of other problems. I mean, it created more problems for the brakes burned out quicker, and then more current and more power. All those issues that I thought were very short-sighted thinking.

Amtrak did the same thing with their heavy cars, and they couldn't fix all the brakes and all that stuff. I'm not sure heavier is better.

*Schrag*

In terms of like architectural design, though, I mean—I'm not sure what my question is here. I guess. To me, it, there were—I think a lot was lost, even when we went to the different upholstery and the older cars, that Metro is an earth tone system.

*Gallagher*

Right.

*Schrag*

Those orange and red seats kind of welcome you on to the terracotta quarry tile. And as soon as they went to blue, part of the battle is lost, and then with the 7000 series, it's all gone.

*Gallagher*

Entirely. So that's one thing we're going to go back to. When they were doing Dulles rail and the new stations, there was a definitely a thought process that certain things have to be preserved. These people wanted to change the quarry tiles. And they tried to do these concrete tiles. I don't know if you remember that happened. They were terrible, so they stopped using them.

Technology is always getting better. The problem with the quarry tiles is that they were popping up. But they have better materials now: adhesives to keep them in place. So that's one of the things.

The granite edge, the blinking lights, the quarry tiles, and I still think the bronze should stay in the underground stations. On grade, stainless steel is fine. I don't have a problem with that. But make it—kind of make it consistent if you can.

But beyond that, the Dulles stations have nothing to do with anything. And I personally have a problem with that. Because those were our stations. We never got to actually—we designed the layout of every station, but we didn't do the canopy, which I would have loved to have done. But I don't think that that's really appropriate for Metro. They have no relationship to what—they were talking about the forest and the trees.

But I just I don't see that relationship to me. And the gull, the gullwing. I understand where the New Air, they call it came from. And that's what—again, it's John Thomas. He said no, we don't have time to think about this. We'll do something later. Potomac Yard is using that New Air canopy. The problem is they don't—engineers—If the architects were in charge equal to the engineers as they used to be, that those kinds of things wouldn't happen, but they're not we always work for somebody else. We do have our own contract, now, as architects. But we don't get really the big, big projects so far, no matter what's going to happen. But I always argued that Metro was as wonderful as it was because Harry Weese had his own contract. And he had his own say, and he was equal with engineers. And I think that's absolutely critical.

We just get treated dirt, a lot of the time. Nobody wants—we get called in to do the painting. Which is how they run the VRE which we were just—it's hardly worth the effort to even be involved with the system. I mean, enough people respect the system that I hope it continues to be maintained.

I know Tom Luebke and those guys are really adamant about making sure things are maintained.

*Schrag*

I'm not going to get too deep into all of the institutional differences. But one of the things that is new is that there's—do you know Jeff Winstel?

*Gallagher*

Of course.

*Schrag*

He's an architectural historian. And he's the first person in that job. That position did not exist. And it has come into existence because of Commission of Fine Arts, and he listed all the agencies who are kind of looking over his shoulder, because it's the State Historic Preservation officers and so forth. The FTA. He's got a really complex field to walk through.

*Gallagher*

He was a token person to put in the office because we were all trying to get them on the National Register: the stations. And Metro did not want that. There was an internal fight. Because the architects all wanted that. So Metro put him in there. And that was being studied to put Metro on the National Register. And Metro engineers didn't want that because they thought it would interfere with their ability to change them, to do whatever they want.

Where that's landed now, I don't know, either. Because I haven't heard anything about that for five years, probably.

*Schrag*

I think it's still a maybe. This is like the George Mason University Medical School. It's always a possibility. But would it be fair to say that the AIA 25 Year award was an effort to maybe push in that direction?

*Gallagher*

Absolutely.

*Schrag*

Because as you said, it's a cultural question, right? How do you get people even to understand what it is, before they put up the speaker, paint the wall. To understand that this is something more than a utilitarian—

*Gallagher*

So that was the big push about the same time we were a group of us were trying to put it on the National Register. There are still living a bunch of old Harry Weese people in Chicago and other places – we were all getting organized. One is Jack Hartray, he was president of Harry Weese when Metro was being designed. He would love to talk to you. And, but what happened was, there was a whole series of problems. Metro just had a very bad time with that. And I'm trying to think what all happened, but the train wreck and all these things that happened that they were just getting really bad press. And the last thing they wanted to hear about was putting it on the national registry.

And nobody at the time—it's like sticking your thumb up in the wind. It's just the wrong time to try to do that. So that all kind of slipped out of everybody's thought process.

*Schrag*

But do you think it would be helpful if the tides turn, to have it on National Register?

*Gallagher*

I think I that the old downtown stations and the gullwing sections should be on the register. That will help protect them. And it will give some teeth to those of us that want to see things improved. The same thing with the speakers. They're still just plastered everywhere. And the wires—I don't know how you get rid of all that. Which is so sad. Because it was just not necessary. But yeah, I would love to. I would still fight to put it on the register. I will fight if somebody gives me an opportunity

*Schrag*

So I think those are my questions. Do you have other topics related to preservation that you think I should cover here?

*Gallagher*

As we've been rewriting the design criteria, we've been putting some stuff in there that hadn't been—I don't know why everything wasn't in there. Some things like the bronze railings and some of the materials. That's being reviewed right now by everybody. Some, I would even push for some more things in there. But I took that—it had just been added to over the years. It's just a hodgepodge of things. I took it completely apart and put it back together in an organized way. So you can kind of follow things.

But yeah, there's still lots of holes in it, of defining things. But it's meant for future building: how you build it, what materials you use, how you do things. I don't think it's as successful as it could be. Yet. And we'll see where that ends up.

But I didn't get much resistance from the things I did do, which was good.

*Schrag*

Is that an approved document now?

*Gallagher*

No, it's still in process. But the comments—it's been in the comment period—the comments are things that are done by the engineers, about various things that are not really relevant to aesthetics at all. But it is what it is. Because that's who is reviewing it.

But I see great hope for Metro. We've been working on the new Blue Line. Well, its whole series of studies about what to do in the future. Rosslyn Tunnel is the biggest problem, because you can only get 26 trains through an hour or something like that. They want to pull one of the lines out. What we ended up with was pulling the Blue Line out, and coming through Georgetown, and coming through town, and to Union Station, out front, and a new station there.

And there are a whole series of different directions to go. Interestingly enough—and it surprised me—the most ridership and the most diversity they could get was by going south and going to the National Harbor, and going across the bridge, the Wilson Bridge to Huntington Station. And that actually surprised me. That's how that came out. And so that's what's on the books now as a future plan. I don't know where it is. We haven't really finished it yet. So it will be on the books, I guess. But that would take a whole lot of effort and thought.

The deep stations, I think, should just be all elevator. That's they do that in Europe. Forest Glen works fine.

*Schrag*

That would be around Georgetown?

*Gallagher*

Georgetown. Yeah. There's a new Rosslyn station too. Right. There would be a pedestrian tunnel between the stations for transfers. Rosslyn seems to work pretty well with the new elevators. People really use it. I haven't been down those escalators in a long time. That's one of those lighting nightmares. Have you seen those escalators? They put like chandeliers on the wall. It's horrible. Claude needs to get over there on that one.

*Schrag*

Yeah, I was wondering. He had some term for, for off the shelf fixtures that pop up somewhere?



*Gallagher*

Oh, yeah. Yeah. We're fighting right now with Union Station Metro 1<sup>st</sup> Street Entrance. And we're doing the architecture. And then the engineers don't want a lighting consultant. And Claude's always worked with us. And I just said, Claude, you need to get involved, I'll just pay you out of our fee to get this right, because they don't want to have spent the money on lighting. I don't know why that wasn't in the contract again, but it's the way engineers think sometimes. We, in fact, on the design criteria—Claude's been working with me on the lighting. I just pay him out of our fee. Because it's important. It's absolutely critical. But it takes it takes a team.

That was what was nice, in the old days with Harry Weese's office. It was really a team. If there was a problem, it was a small enough group that like Forest Glen station. There were maybe six of us—I mean, including all the engineers—would sit around a table like this. And we'd throw out ideas and do this and we all go out and get a beer and we keep working while we're working to come back. And we would solve all the problems.

One of the things was that everything was always perpendicular with the tracks and everything. And they had a crossover at the far end of the station. And I said, well, in this underground station, no one's ever going to know, if the station platforms are not parallel. Those two shotgun stations. So why not make those platform angle so they can meet at one end, so you can get to that crossover. Without having to go way down the line. The civil engineers thought, that's a great idea. So that's what happened that station is built like this.

*Schrag*

The tracks approaching are not parallel?

*Gallagher*

They're not parallel. And you'd never know, inside. They're tapering towards the center—to get the crossover closer to the platform. But it was a real team. Everybody can contribute to any idea. And I'm sure they had aesthetic ideas, and they contributed too, the engineers. So that was what was really nice about that whole thing.

But now there's so many people, there's like fifteen firms probably. And we all never sit in the same room together. So it's much more difficult now, in my opinion. And even though the amount of work that was being done back then was huge—because they were doing everything and now we're just doing little pieces—and there's too many people involved and not enough camaraderie between them to really get to a good solid solution.

So just a bizarre little thing. Crystal City right now, that was originally an open stairway and elevators coming up from an underground mezzanine. When JBG got involved, they decided they're going to build a building on that site and have this entry come up. And the mezzanine is under the building. So that's been on the table for about two years. And the design build drawings are due next week. And last week, Metro's structural engineer looked at it and said, Oh, you can't build that building on top of our entrance. We're not going to allow the foundations to be shared, we're not going to allow that. You've got to build your own foundations. So that's been my little chore this week.

I went through a logical process of looking at what's happened in the past. If you're building over the station, over the tracks anywhere where the trains are involved, yes, you need to separate the structure because of vibrations and stray currents and all that stuff. But if it's not over the tracks, if it's outside that train envelope, you can. So as far as I can tell, Gallery Place, the Convention Center in Mount Vernon Square, and Navy Yard—we did Navy Yard—were all built using the structure of the buildings above them. The ceiling in Gallery Place is the floor of the convention center. That's it was all built as one project. It is not separate structure. And the same—I'm pretty sure that's I need to go look at this—pretty sure that's the same at the convention center. That

new mezzanine was built as part of that buildings. It's not a separate structure. If it's over the tracks, I think it needs—it should be separate. But if it's not, it could be the same.<sup>3</sup>

So anyway, we're having this big battle. I'm getting ready for that meeting on Friday. It's always exciting. It's always something new. But you know, I just hope they continue in a good way.

I'm sorry Dulles isn't a little more part of the system. But at least they haven't don't have any really, really bad things that have happened.

Potomac Yard is going to be a real oddball station too. And it doesn't have a lot to do with the system. The City of Alexandria really wanted to be part of their look, they wanted it to look historic. And Park Service wanted it to be wood and stone. And it's just like, we were about eight years on that project. And I'm not really that proud of it.

*Schrag*

I'm trying to remember if there was something like that with King Street.

*Gallagher*

King Street Oh, yes. Oh, yeah, absolutely. Harry had a fit, because Alexandra did not want the gull wing. So they had to do this sort of historic canopy. So that's another good example of—what Harry was not pleased with that. And it may have been that able to be better. We did the addition to the King Street Station back in 2001 or two, but we copied that and picked it up and put it across the street. Because it's all one station. So that's where—to do something else or would even be worse, I thought.

A really bad one was National Airport where they extended using new canopies with a curve. It meets the gull wing. That is just atrocious. To me that that should have never happened. They needed to do the same canopy when they are butting up like that, or be entirely different. They're just, that's an awful one. Those are the only ones I could think of right now.

*Schrag*

I'm trying to remember. There's some station on the Orange Line in Prince George's County that Stan Allen, I think, told me that Weese really liked. There's some suspended structure or something. Cheverly, maybe?

*Gallagher*

Cheverly is my least favorite station. I'm sure Harry did have a hand in that. It's a side platform gull wing and there's only two of those in the system. And that's Cheverly and Eisenhower. And the problem with the side platform is it's really a big cantilever, and they had a hard time keeping these those curves level for construction purposes. They just never did that again. But Cheverly had a hard time in construction. The gull wing comes up. And then the bridge—it's kind of bridge over.

The whole idea of that was nice: the bridge spans over and you have the curves that come down. But it wasn't executed all that well.

---

<sup>3</sup> From Gallagher, July 27, 2021. This is a current discussion about Crystal City. Metro Structural wants the new mezzanine to have a separate structure from the new building above. In this case the new building and mezzanine are off to the side of the existing Metro Station. In similar cases - Gallery Place Mezzanine under the Arena, Mt Vernon mezzanine under the convention center and Navy Yard, National's Entrance under a new office building - all share building structure. But are not over the tracks. At Union Station 1st Street Entrance, the mezzanine is over the tracks and below the taxi ramp and USRC parking garage. In this case the structure is separate - that is due to vibrations from the trains and the possibility of stray current coming from the trains. I think we can prove our case with these examples - Crystal City is not over the trains!

*Schrag*

The canopies?

*Gallagher*

Yeah, I would have to go back and look at that. But then a lot of trouble with that what was being built. And Eisenhower's the same way. It's just a little odd.

I think it could have been all right. It was part of the system for sure. I'm sure Harry had something to do with that. But that was all designed before I was there. But those are the only two side platform, exterior stations, I think, in the system. I believe they are. I'd have to work on that a minute. Now we have Potomac Yards side platforms.

Those eight years that I was there, they were building everywhere. So not only we were designing, but we were also part of the field crew. I mean, we did everything. Like I said I walked all the Red Line tunnels from Dupont to the end of the Connecticut tunnel. And Forest Glen and Wheaton at the other. And it just, it was just amazing construction, just to see that. And to experience that.

I would spend my weekends going out, nothing was locked up, back in those days. You'd just come up Connecticut Avenue, and there would be construction. Go through the gate and climb down the ladders and down into the stations and every station was in a different phase of work. And there was one—they mined through with the machines, and then they came back and did what they call a pilot tunnel above that on top. And then they would mine that down to create a natural vault, and then they eventually take out the middle. So that's how they built those stations. We were walking through that one of those mined pilot tunnels one weekend, and we got to a point and the rocks had caved in. And they were hanging from rock bolts and a big pile of rocks on the floor. And we thought you know, I'm not going to do this again. Because we if we if that had caved in while we were done that nobody would have ever known we were there. And probably never have found us. They would get into machine and dig it out. And so I went through the stations, but never went to a pilot tunnel again.

But it's just was such a wonderful, wonderful career, starting a career to have that incredible experience. Metro had what they called the problem-solving team. And it was a bunch of engineers, and there was always one architect, and we all rotated. I had my six months or a year on that team. And we would be assigned a problem on like a Tuesday. And we had one week to get a solution to that. And we had to come back the next week and report what the solution was. And some were like speakers—just all sorts of problems, construction problems. And that was incredibly educational, try to figure out how to solve some of these issues that they ran into on the field. I'm trying think of any good ones. But that was just really educational. Because you got to hear all the problems at those meetings.

So those years at Weese's office were just so broad and so full of information and knowledge. It's just really changed my entire life, my attitude towards architecture. We try to run our office that way. I don't know how successful we are, but we're probably too relaxed. But we everybody works hard to get things done.

I hope I've answered your questions. I'm sure I'll think of more information.

*Schrag*

I do hope to be in touch. I'll send you a draft when it's ready, but this has been extremely helpful. Thank you so much.

*Gallagher*

Why, you're certainly welcome.

*Schrag*

Okay, I'll stop the recording.